



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/648,023	08/25/2000	Raj Mahadevaiah	E001.P001U1	4559

7590 10/24/2002

Bryan W Bockhop Esq  
Bockhop & Reich LLP  
3235 Satellite Boulevard  
Bldg 400 Suite 300  
Duluth, GA 30096

EXAMINER

SINGH, RAMNANDAN P

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2644

DATE MAILED: 10/24/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/648,023	MAHADEVAIAH, RAJ
	Examiner Dr. Ramnandan Singh	Art Unit 2644

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 August 2000.

2a) This action is **FINAL**.      2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 25 August 2000 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.

3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Drawings*

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the telephone selection circuit must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from claim 2. Further, claims 3-8 recite features, such as a message play back, a visual indication, a video display, a text message and a symbol generator. A functional architecture of interceptor 110 must show **how** these discrete feature modules are **functionally** related to the interceptor. No new matter should be entered.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable

one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

In claim 1, “**a delay circuit, responsive to the counter, the ring signal and the user input, that is programmed to**” is not enabled, because the applicant’s disclosure does not teach a **user-programmable computer** connected to the telephone call interceptor to program the delay and the counter as desired.

A similar thing holds for claim 9.

In addition, in Claim 2, “**telephone selection circuit**” is not enabled, as the instant disclosure does not teach this circuit. Further, the functional architecture of the applicant’s apparatus 110 for intercepting telephone calls does not disclose a controller for selecting some of the plurality of telephones.

Also, in claim 13, “**a circuit that is integrated into the telephone**” is not enabled, because the disclosure teaches a telephone interceptor to be used **with** a set of telephones, not integrated **into** the telephone. As a result, in claim 11, “**a code entered on a keypad of the telephone**” is not enabled. Also, as claim 12 is dependent from claim 11, and claim 14 dependent from claim 13, they are also not enabled.

As a result, the disclosure provides **insufficient information** on the overall programming processor unit integrated into the telephone call interceptor. Therefore, a person skilled in the art will not be able to make and/or use the invention without **undue experimentation**

[MPEP 2164.01].

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Borg et al [US 4,578,540].

Regarding claims 1-2 and 9, Borg et al teaches a device and method for telephone call intercepting. The device, a telephone call interceptor (or telecommunications system) [ col. 1, lines 62-67], as shown in Fig. 1, comprising a **ring detector** (140), a telephone signal receiver (115), a dial tone detector (160), a ring generator (119), a data processor (110) , a **user-activated** data input device (117), a data output device (113), memory (111), and a clock 112, wherein data processor (110) is a **user-programmable computer**; and data entry device (117) facilitates user entry of data , such as a **delay request** by the user, so that **the data processor may simply delay acting until a predetermined period of time has elapsed** [col. 6,lines 4-14; col. 6, lines 38-

56; col. 6, lines 60-68; col. 7, lines 1-8; col. 8, lines 61-67; Abstract]. One feature of the telecommunications system is that a pre-selected number of rings may be counted before the system answers an incoming call [col. 8, lines 61-67; col. 9, lines 1-2]. However, Borg et al does not teach expressly some feature of the device having a delay **programmed** to allow the telephone to ring if more than the selected amount of time has passed since the user input was last inserted. Since the data processor (110) is a user-programmable computer, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to program this feature using the data entry device 117 [col. 11, lines 18-24; col. 2, lines 30-40; col. 3, lines 1-45], and make the telephone call interceptor more user-friendly and useful.

Regarding claim 3, Borg et al teaches a telephone call interceptor having a message playback feature with a speech processor (or a voice message synthesizer) 150. Responsive to data processor 110, speech processor 150 constructs and transmits appropriate message in either direction [col. 5, lines 25-35]. In this context, a pre-selected number of rings may be counted before the interceptor system answers an incoming call using a standard message [col. 8, lines 61-68; col. 9, lines 1-2].

Regarding claims 4-8, Borg et al teaches a telephone call interceptor having a data output device 113 attached to data processor 110 [Fig. 1]. This

device also operates in conjunction with speech processor 150. In practice, data output devices 113 may be a loudspeaker, visual or other output devices. These may include light emitting diode(LED) display, or fluorescent display. In addition, the data processor 110, **a locally programmable computer**, may operate in conjunction with a customer provided **television set** or an inexpensive **computer monitor** to enhance video displays and message generating functions [col. 6, lines 42-59].

Regarding claim 10, Borg et al teaches sensing closing of contacts CM, RPM1 and RPM2 local to the telephone [Fig. 1; col. 5, lines 36-45; col. 8, lines 56-60].

6. Claims 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Borg et al as applied to claim 1 above, and further, in view of Borg et al or Hayes et al [4,582,957].

Regarding claims 4-5, a **visual incoming call indicator** and an **indicator light** are inherent features of a telephone call interceptor.

Borg et al teaches these features as shown above.

Alternatively, Hayes et al also teaches a call interceptor having a message waiting unit providing a visual indication for an incoming call and an indicator light [col. 2, lines 12-24; col. 2, lines 45-52].

7. Claims 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Borg et al as applied to claims 1 and 4 above, and further, in view of Borg et al or Shtivelman et al [US 6,078,481] or Gordon et al [US 5,459,584].

Regarding claims 6-8, Borg et al teaches these features as shown above.

Alternatively, Shtivelman et al teaches a client's computer station that is adapted to deal with incoming call in a variety of ways. The client's software may display a **telephone icon**, for example, on the **video display** of the computer, and the alert signal may result in an "audio" ringing [col. 5, lines 30-49].

Further, alternatively, Gordon et al teaches a relatively **low cost adapter** which connects the **user's telephone** to an available **television set**. Fig. 9 shows a processor 195 for controlling the device, a keypad 196 for the input of user commands, a **video display generator** 199 and a RF modulator suitable for supplying a display signal to the ordinary **television set 201**; wherein the primary function of the processor is to **intercept incoming calls** [col. 16, lines 41-53; col. 19, lines 5-8]. Further, a **text message may be generated** by a supervisor for the user of the telephone using the keypad 196 relating to a **telephone call** destined for the user of the telephone, wherein this text message will be transmitted via digital communication link.

8. Claims 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Borg et al as applied to claim 9 above, and further, in view of D'Agosto, III et al [US 4,860,339].

Regarding claims 11-12, Borg et al does not teach expressly sensing of a code entered on a keypad of the telephone.

D'Agosto, III et al teaches a telephone terminal comprising a keypad 24 with user programmable keys 30 and 32 [Fig. 1; col. 6, lines 42-68; col. 7, lines 19-38; col. 8, lines 47-66; col. 9, lines 30-68] that sense different codes [col. 20., lines 16-32].

Borg et al and D'Agosto, III et al are analogous art because they are from a similar problem solving area, viz. , a telephone call interceptor.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the telephone keypad of D'Agosto, III et al with Borg et al to provide a user to enter desired features through programming of the soft keys of the telephone keypad.

Regarding claims 13-14, the combination of Borg et al and D'Agosto, III et al teaches a telephone interceptor that integrated into the telephone that operates with a telephone exchange carrier [D'Agosto, III et al; Fig. 9].

***Conclusion***

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dr. Ramnandan Singh whose telephone number is (703)308-6270. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F(8:00-4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Forester Isen can be reached on (703)-305-4386. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)872-9314 for regular communications and (703)872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)306-0377.

Dr. Ramnandan Singh  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2644



October 19, 2002

FAN TSANG  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

